

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed August 31, 2004 has been reviewed and carefully considered. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Claims 1 and 3-11 are pending in the present application.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Jaffe et al. (hereinafter "Jaffe"). Claims 1-5 and 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Description of Related Art in the Background of the Invention in view of Jaffe.

Jaffe is directed to a resonant microcavity display (Jaffe, Title). Jaffe discloses that "[a] resonant microcavity display (20) having microcavity with a substrate (25), a phosphor active region (50) and front and rear reflectors (30 and 60)" (Jaffe, Abstract). Moreover, Jaffe discloses that "the RMD can be used in a **CRT** as a **direct view television**" (Jaffe, col. 15, lines 27-28). Thus, Jaffe essentially discloses a cathode ray tube (CRT) type television that uses a resonant microcavities.

In contrast, independent Claim 1 is directed to "[a] **projection type** display unit" (Claim 1, preamble) having a **LCOS device** as an imager (Claim 1, body), independent Claim 6 is directed to "[a]n illumination source for a **LCOS projection system**" (Claim 6, preamble), Claim 9 is directed to "[a] method for displaying an image" (Claim 9, preamble) wherein light is projected through an **LCOS imager** (Claim 9, body).

A Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) display is NOT a Liquid Crystal On Silicon (LCOS) projection system or a LCOS device and, in the prior art, does NOT use a LCOS device.

Moreover, a CRT display is a “direct view” type of display not a “projection” type of display. While the claimed invention is directed to a projection type display unit that includes a LCOS imager (Claim 1), an illumination source for a LCOS projection system (Claim 6), and a method that projects light through an LCOS imager (Claim 9), Jaffe essentially discloses the CRT with resonant cavities as a standalone viewing device (a direct view device). In fact, three CRTs are recited in Claim 3. Conventional televisions employing CRT technology typically use ONLY ONE CRT. For example, as disclosed in the Applicants’ specification, “CRT type displays have generally been used in applications to directly produce an image using color phosphors. By comparison, the present invention makes use of CRT enhanced with a resonant microcavity array exclusively as a light source of selected wavelength having relatively high intensity and good spectral purity. In particular, the present invention makes use of such a CRT in a LCOS type display” (Applicants’ specification, p. 7, lines 19-23). Accordingly, Jaffe does not teach or suggest at the following limitations of Claim 6: “[a]n illumination source for a LCOS projection system, comprising ... an array of resonant microcavities excited by said CRT for exclusively generating light of a selected color **for the LCOS projection system**”. A reference cited against a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 must disclose each and every limitation of the rejected claim. Accordingly, independent Claim 6 is patentably distinct and non-obvious over Jaffe for at least the reasons set forth above.

Moreover, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention when there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either implicitly or explicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art (see,

e.g., MPEP §2143.01). However, the Applicants respectfully assert that no such teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists. That is, Jaffe, either taken singly and/or in combination with the Background of the Invention and/or even in further combination with the skill possessed by an artisan in the related art, does not teach or even remotely suggest “[a] projection type display unit, comprising, an imager defining a plurality of controllable pixels ..., wherein said imager is an LCOS device” as recited in independent Claim 1, or [a] method for displaying an image, comprising, ...**projecting said light through an LCOS imager**” as recited in independent Claim 9. For example, Jaffe does not even include one single occurrence of “LCOS”. Moreover, since CRT displays and projection type displays such as LCOS’ are considered to be two completely different types of displays with different advantages and disadvantages associated with each, the Applicants’ respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the related art would not contemplate combining CRT technology with LCOS technology, as has been novelly combined by the Applicants’ as represented by the pending claims. Further, there is no mention in Jaffe of the cause of the problem addressed by the present invention, namely a HIGH ARC LAMP. It is not surprising that Jaffe does not mention a HIGH ARC LAMP as a problem to be addressed in his invention, since Jaffe is directed to CRT-based displays which do NOT typically use a HIGH ARC LAMP, while the present invention is directed to projection type displays and LIQUID CRYSTAL ON SILICON (LCOS) displays which typically do use a HIGH ARC LAMP. Clearly, a HIGH ARC LAMP has different advantages and disadvantages over other type of light sources. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully assert that Jaffe, either taken singly and/or in combination with the Background of the Invention and/or even in further combination with the skill possessed by an artisan in the related art, does not teach or

suggest all of the above-identified limitations of independent Claims 1 and 9. Moreover, the Applicants respectfully assert that no teaching, suggestion, or motivation exists as required to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 6, and 9 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 2-5 depend either directly or indirectly on Claim 1 and, thus, include all of the limitations of Claim 1. Claims 7-8 depend either directly or indirectly on Claim 6 and, thus, include all of the limitations of Claim 6. Claims 10-11 depend either directly or indirectly on Claim 9 and, thus, include all of the limitations of Claim 9. Accordingly, Claims 2-5, 7-8, and 10-11 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 1, 6, and 9, respectively.

Thus, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-11 are patentable and nonobvious over the cited references. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application. Such early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

In the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's representatives
Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 23, 2004

By: 

Joseph J. Kolodka
Registration No. 39,731

THOMSON LICENSING INC.
2 Independence Way
Princeton, NJ 08540

JJK/eh